

Appln No. 10/774,505
Amdt. Dated May 23, 2005
Response to Office action of March 7, 2005

2

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minami, Scarlata, Andjelic and Johnson, Chaloupka or Blair. Applicant considers that the fact that the Examiner has had to cite at least four documents in combination establishes a case that the combination of features presented by claim 1 is a non-obvious combination that is not readily found in the prior art. The Applicant argues that the skilled addressee would not, as a matter of routine, seek to combine all of the citations required to arrive at the invention defined by present claim 1. The complexities involved in selecting, out of the myriad of possible combinations presented by the total pool of teachings of the cited art, the one specific combination of features presently claimed, would place a heavy burden on the non-skilled worker.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minami, Scarlata, Andjelic and Johnson, Chaloupka or Blair, further in view of Boss. In addition to the documents used in combination against claim 1, the Examiner has indicated a single additional citation, namely Boss. The Applicant considers that the fact that at least 5 documents are required in combination to teach all of the features of present claim 2 establishes a case that the combination defined by claim 2 would not be obvious to the skilled addressee.

In light of these arguments, the Applicant considers that the claims are inventive over the cited prior art and respectfully requests that the application be allowed.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762